CANDOUR The British Views-Letter

To defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance

Vol 39, Nos 2 & 3 *Registered at the G.P.O. as a Newspaper* February-March, 1988

SLAVERY THROUGH FREEDOM

by ROSINE DE BOUNEVIALLE

Some years ago the so-called Conservative Party produced the slogan *Independence through Interdependence* which was not only nonsense but treasonable nonsense, since it was Her Majesty's own allegedly tyrannised colonial subjects whom Her Majesty's Government with the connivance of Her Majesty's Opposition proposed to "set free" from their allegiance to the British Crown. That all-party treason, the League of Empire Loyalists never failed to condemn both in and out of Parliament during its many confrontations with the arch traitors Harold Macmillan and Edward Heath. But although its protests captured world headlines, it entirely failed to halt their wholesale disintegration of the British world, or to move a single member of either Lords or Commons to more effective action than the writing of an occasional letter to *The Times*. Today, with party roles reversed and without proclaiming anything more evocative than "detente" Her Majesty's Government and Opposition pursue interdependence through independence, which is to say: slavery through freedom. In the modern idiom that plainly means slavery to the forces of evil through freedom from any constraining moral law. And still no worm has turned.

Of course the pre-inter-and-post-was propaganda assault on our common senses did not begin like that. It began with "Fighting evil things" and, ". . . avoiding new Dark Ages on the road to broad sunlit uplands" by way of the "four freedoms "announced in the Atlantic Charter, the product of those two be-spoke world statemen Churchill and Roosevelt — One-World statesmen would be a better description, for what devotion to those Four Freedoms has led us to is: denial of Objective Truth; promotion of Communism; fear of the atomic bomb; and the plunging of all nations into unpayable debt. The last three were off to a good start almost immediately; the first and most destructive of all, grew "vaster than empires and more slow" until today the humanist conscience is so supreme that Christians "must co-operate with Communists because they are so sincere"!

In 1945, with the unconditional surrender of "the enemy in sight", the demolition of obstructive allies began in earnest. The first to be consigned to red oblivion was Nationalist China (one of the Big Four "united nations" historians may remember in some more conscience-stricken future). Half Europe had already been thrust into the Soviet maw; the other half had begun its reluctant journey towards "United Europe".

In the summer of 1947, what must be supposed to be the definitive overall plan was published in a paper called *Design for Europe* which contained an outline of the motives, intentions and camouflaging propaganda of the One World planners. It makes obvious that the authors were well aware that the majority of mankind might have quite different ideas about what constitutes a desirable arrangement for promoting "the good life", and to explain the need for smokescreens and camouflage wrote:

"Quite clearly, the plan to be adopted, even on the purely economic level, must be too vast to be prepared in detail before it is undertaken. Its shape must be subject to modification as we go. Moreover — and it is as well to state this bluntly at the outset — *no government dependent on a democratic vote could possibly agree in advance to the sacrifices which any adequate plan must involve.* (Ed's italics) The people must be led slowly and unconsciously into the abandonment of their traditional economic defences . . ."

So, in the thirty years of psychological warfare waged against them, the people at large have been brain-washed into condoning every surrender of their defences; even the unassailable rock of Christianity has been vacated in a catastrophic descent to the humanist plane where "justice and peace" is promised in the Republic of Man on Earth. What with the carrot of "One peaceful world" and the stick of nuclear destruction alternately dangled and brandished, no one who has read and studied the implications of this document could suppose the "Design" was intended to stop at "Europe". But how many, other than the initiates, *have* read it? The answer is in the glacial decline of the Western nations. The final break can only be accomplished if the two-fold pressure can be maintained in its present Arctic silence.

That is why our Planners have always intended to gain control of the world by means of cold war. In 1945, after the discovery of nuclear energy, an updated plan was put into operation that was calculated to reach completion by 1980-84. The main objectives in that cold war plan were:

1. To destroy the will to resist.
2. To construct the machinery of a dictatorship in each country.
3. To destroy the defences of Britain and other nations of the free world.
4. To destroy British and American strategic industries along with those of other Western nations.
5. To deprive nations other than the Soviet Union and France of the energy required for strategic industry.
6. To deprive Britain and other non-Soviet countries of essential raw materials, especially of minerals.
7. To limit and control food resources.
8. To give the Soviets all possible assistance in building up their attacking forces, and to recruit terrorists for carrying out guerilla activities.

And if that reads like chapter headings for a second volume of *The protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* no one need be surprised. Equally, no one need bother to argue its authenticity since the results are plain enough, it is only the personalities of its originators that remain somewhat obscure, the instruments employed cannot be concealed.

According to an eye witness who was present at a meeting held in October, 1940, "the head of the political group of the Soviet subversive organization in Britain outlined its functions and policies to a group of would-be recruits. Apart from the Communist, Marxists, World Federalists and numerous other smoke-screen groups, the inner circle embraced three sections, political, economic and biological (which included psychological warfare), with the head of the biological section the overall director. Members of the political group had been ordered to leave or refrain from joining the overt Communist Party. The majority were then in the Labour Party while some joined the Conservative Party. These two factions were to pose as "moderates" so that if the plans to put Labour in absolute control by the mid-seventies were not successful they could join together to form a 'National' Government."

The psychological warfare group aided by the IMF are obviously doing their stuff in pursuit of this aim while Thatcher and Heath are busy taking turns at the Conservative tiller to prevent the ship steering any true course in the immigration sea.

To return to 1940, "other orders given to the political section included building the machinery of a dictatorship, while those entering the Conservative Party had special responsibility for the exercise now known as the E.E.C."

Current events show how flexible are the roles.

"They were also ordered to neutralise Britain and India. Even the little protection from harmful legislation still provided by the House of Lords was to be abolished; while they were to destroy Britain's defences, not only running down the armed forces but also their equipment and the country's capacity to manufacture military hardware, while handing over naval and other bases to the Soviets. Aden, Malta and Gibraltar were specifically mentioned.

But even at that stage, in October 1940, the top priority, the single most important thing they had to do, was to ensure the total destruction of Rhodesia, and after Rhodesia, South Africa."

And no wonder — not only were those countries bang in the middle of the action; *they had the potential to defy the Money Power,* and the closest ties with Britain of blood, defence, trade and sentiment. The British people would not easily be persuaded to make enemies of their brothers-in-arms of two world wars and such an alliance would spell death to One World aspiration. Therefore, in both Britain and Southern Africa, the "will to resist" must be eroded to extinction.

The front line troops used in that priority are the witting and unwitting warriors of the Do-Gooding Brigade. Idealists, made chronically or wilfully blind who, regardless of the exposed disastrous nature of the League of Nations had immediately welcomed its hell-born babe, the United Nations, with all the loving gestures of a mother receiving her long lost child returned to her arms by repentant fairies. This monstrous offspring was not, of course, a changeling — it was "that way" already. The communising of half Asia and Europe; the rape of the Congo; the mongrelization of the White races; and the elevation to supremacy of the humanist conscience are just some of the results of the activities of this war-making-for-peace creature of the "Free World". But since like Dorian Gray's, its repellant portrait is kept concealed in the attic by the media, it is still one of the most successful weapons for encouraging idealists and confusing issues* while emboldening subversives and confounding critics.

---

*So in 1956, we had Eden jumping the Suez gun by sending British troops "to establish an International Police Force" there (that was his declared intention though many have forgotten it) and getting his internationalist ear swiped by Eisenhower in the interest of their Financial Masters for whom the "entry of the Gladiolus" was a little too presumptious. There is to be no doubt who calls the tune. A hundred million pounds worth of British property was abandoned in the Canal Zone and the Israelis had the Sinai to bargain with. What a useful piece of desert that has turned out to be.

Southern Africa, however, for too long remained impervious to the exhortations of both the U.N. and internal do-gooders. To gain the jackpot, some more subtle method of dealing a winning hand must be found.

Up to 1965 and Ian Smith's unilateral declaration of independence, Southern Africa stood apparently as solid as a rock. But from the moment the Rhodesian leader, instead of logically repudiating once and for all the pretensions of the Westminster stooges whilst re-emphasizing allegiance to the British Crown, did exactly the opposite by declaring his country an independent republic ready to negotiate "peace" with her enemies, Southern Africa's seemingly solid front crumbled into a confusion of divided "freedom" seekers.

The contrived Portuguese collapse that laid open Rhodesia's east-west flanks to attack from internationally backed, communist slave states was greeted with Smithian complacency, as were the preremptory calls for "settlement" emanating from his South African ally, Vorster. South Africans were seemingly undisturbed, equally by their Premier's expressed desire to rid them of the Rhodesian "encumbrance" as by the Suez-like withdrawal of the South African forces from Angola. "Settlement" pervaded the Namibian air, and the voice of the negotiator was heard in the land.

To innocent eyes, these compromising attitudes in the face of undeniable menace looked extremely odd, and to eyes as suspicious as experience has made ours — even odder than that.

These two Prime Ministers were, and to a great extent still are, venerated as heroes of the resistance to the Sovietization of the world, and yet Kissinger treated the one as a defeated suppliant and the other as a subordinate ally. Over the years, *Candour* has predicted, and deplored, each successive step Smith has taken along the path conveniently laid down by the psychological warfarers, all the way from the traitor Macmillan's "wind of change" to another traitor's present installation in a neighbouring slave state of one who is intended to be the last Carver before Rhodesia is put permanently out of joint. From the first, A. K. Chesterton strained many friendships because he persisted in warning of the likelihood of what has since occurred. But still — "Ah", say the Smith worshippers, "think of the pressure he is under". Which only shows how essential is the use of the psychological warfare that can persuade Rhodesians, against all commonsense, (a) that "settlement" is necessary for their well being, and (b) that the "pressure" will cease somewhere short of complete surrender.

Rhodesia, like South Africa, Spain and Portugal, had precisely as much true independence as her leaders cared to exercise; and the fact that the latter countries never gave an inch — far less a centimetre — until Verwoerd, Franco and Salazar were dead, makes one wonder if it was only in Britain and the USA that suitable tools somehow arrive in key positions at fortuitous moments in our murkier history.

So much for latter-day freedom — what about neo-slavery.

A slave being one who subsists as the physical possession of another whilst owning nothing himself, this situation may not yet be ours as individuals, but as a nation we are near enough for it to effect all our powers of decision. So long as we remain in hock to international moneylenders, we own nothing — not even North Sea oil.

Questions of defence are settled, never to our advantage, by foreigners at international conferences held for the most part *in camera,* and whatever superior weapons or technology we may produce is either summararily destroyed to be rebuilt in the enemy's arsenal, or it is transferred whole, accompanied in many instances by the technologists themselves. Such things used to travel via the United States but today they go through NATO or even directly to the Soviets by "agreement". The only attempt at camouflage lies in the periodical exposure of a "spy ring".

To quote again our 1940 "Eye witness":

"During the SALT discussions, for instance, Kissinger accepted Soviet dictation of all key provisions of the agreements. The Soviets were granted a 41% superiority in land based missiles, 34% superiority in sea based missiles, and a 50% superiority in submarines; the Soviets modernized their anti-ballistic missile system, while the Unied States shut theirs down, and so on. An eight-to-one American military superiority vanished in less than a decade. The United States is financing and building the largest truck (or tank) factory in the world on the Kana River, the largest shipyard in the world on the Black Sea, and so on. One interesting detail was that the American Army, and others, were ordered to stop all support for resarch on the treatment of those radiation injuries that form a part of the emotional brainwashing attack on nuclear breeder reactors. A similar ban on this type of research, though less obtrusive, is in force in Britain. Such sabotage of nuclear energy projects gives the Soviets, with their immense naval superiority, control over the greater part of our fuel supplies.

Britain is also giving the Soviets all available scientific and technical knowledge and aid. A series of technical and trade treaties and agreements, dating from May 24th, 1959, have steadily increased in scope, until by the implementation of the Treaty on "Cooperation in the fields of Applied Science and Technology (1968, Cmnd. 3710. Anthony Wedgewood Benn) and the "Long Term Trade Agreement between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the USSR" (Cmnd. 4019, June 1969, Anthony Crosland) we have agreed to hand over vertually the whole of our science and technology. Later treaties have served to increase the scope of our committment. When a not inconsiderable proportion of the information that various Government departments demand is for handing over to the Soviets. Who needs spys?

There is also the question of what we get "in return" for all this information (without which the USSR

could not have built up their massive military potential). Apart from the exchange of personnel, propaganda material for the BBC, and other comparatively minor matters there are:

(a) What the Chairman of the East European Trade Council, Sir John Stevens, referred to in 1971, during a meeting of the United Kingdom — USSR Inter-Governmental Commission for cooperation in Applied Science, Technology, Trade and Economic Relations, as "inferior" barter. That is, goods that we don't need or want, and that interfere with our consumer industry. Agents in the TUC etc are now asking for selective import controls, to restrict our imports from friendly nations — helping to depress their economies — but with no corresponding restrictions on the Soviet bloc, so making us even more dependent on the Soviets.

(b) "Superior" barter. We agree to accept from the Soviets essential raw materials, chromium, nickel, and so on. Under this heading also comes Article 7 of the Crosland Treaty (Cmnd. 4091, 1969) that in practice has been found to make provision for the Soviets to take over a considerable proportion of our ships and shipping routes. This has assisted, along with sanctions by the EEC, in cutting us off from our previous suppliers.

ATTACK ON THE COMMONWEALTH

At the same time that some of the most horrifying details of the agreements under the 1968 and 1969 Treaties were being discussed (January 1971) Heath and Kaunda cooperated to sow the seeds of total destruction of the Commonwealth, that was designed to ensure the destruction of Rhodesia and South Africa and the takeover of the Cape route. The Times Leader commented that "President Kaunda's document is couched in the same language as Mr. Heath's speech yesterday . . . identical phrases appear over and over again'.

What they did was to overthrow the Balfour formula which defined the theoretical basis for the Commonwealth association at the Imperial Conference of 1926 . . . "the self-governing communities . . . are autonomous countries within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate to one another in any aspect of their domestic or external relations".

At the Singapore Commonwealth Conference in 1971, this concept of mutual cooperation was replaced by that of mutual hate:

"Each of us will vigorously combat this evil within our own nation. No country will afford to regions which practice racial discrimination assistance which, in its own judgement, directly contributes to the pursuit and consolidation of this evil policy".

In making these changes Heath and Kaunda had the enthusiastic support of the Canadian Premier, Trudeau, who in 1965 was miraculously converted from Chinese Communism to Liberal, and only two years later was Minister of Justice in a Liberal Government.

In practice the interpretation of this has come to mean a fanatical denial of the genetic fact that racial characteristics are different, and on the part of those in control an all-out attempt to establish extreme Marxist dictatorships and to overthrow those regions not willing to submit to Soviet (World Federalist) demands. In 1964 Rhodesia was excluded from the Commonwealth Conference. Last year Callaghan invited to Britain at tax-payers expense Rhodesian terrorists — men who have encouraged intimidation, torture and murder in an attempt to turn ordinary Rhodesian Africans against their Chiefs and their Government.

(c) Investment in major strategic industries in the Soviet Union instead of in Britain. It is interesting that multinational firms seem to have cooperated willingly, but that British firms have mostly been nationalized or brought under direct Government control before they cooperated. British science, technology, and strategic industry are being run down, and the investment that would otherwise have gone into our industry is going into Soviet strategic industry.

Britain is mostly responsible for assisting in building up the Soviet internal communications, with the railway network and containerized transport (allowing, for example, direct passage from the Soviet Union to Ulster), and in assisting them build up their power supplies. with the gift of nuclear know-how, and large scale investment in gas and oil extraction and distribution. The nationalized Rolls Royce Company has agreed to supply engines for pumping stations and other heavy industrial plant, while they are reported to be building factories to make the Soviets independent of us. They have also agreed to supply engines for Chinese military jets. All this is made palatable by the psychological warfare experts as "desirable export orders" that give short term assistance to our "balance of trade", although it is long term industrial and military suicide.

(d) Credit facilities: this means in practice that Britain borrows at a high rate of interest and lends at a low rate of interest — little is said about the time lag between us supplying goods and receiving payment. Already thousands of millions of pounds would appear to be involved.

All this means that we are financing the Soviet arms build-up in Africa indirectly as well as directly, through our "Foreign Aid" to the African dictators, with no control over the use which is made of that aid. Britain is thus already giving assistance to the criminals operating in Rhodesia. The Government has already announced that in the present crisis, where there is a need to economise, aid to Marxist countries is the one thing where there are no plans to cut expenditure. Yet if Rhodesia and South Africa fall into the hands of the terrorists and/or the Soviets we will be without chromium and other vital minerals and we will lose the Cape shipping

route, that carries a great deal of our food, fuel and mineral supplies.

The 1968, 1969 and subsequent treaties with the Soviet Union purport to take care of those problems. Under them the Inter-Governmental Commission was set up. At its first meeting, in London, in January 1971 a number of agreements were arrived at, including the provisions for "superior" barter. RTZ was to arrange for us to import nickel from the USSR, possibly some of the copper "that they may help to extract at Udokham in Siberia, the British Steel Corporation will import iron ore as part of the payment for helping the Soviets to set up an ore processing plant, and so on . . . The solution was to put us firmly in the hands of the Soviets and the multinational corporations.

So far as the transport of goods from the Far East was concerned, the "Times" editorial of the 19th January 1971 revealed that:

"There is also a plan to link Europe and the Pacific by a railway container network, in which both Britain and Japan have user as well as builder interests. None of this can be achieved, however, without western technology and know-how. Moreover it is likely that western industrial groups will be asked to engineer and instal the associated equipment. The total value of the project will be great, probably in excess of £500 million altogether, with a similar amount for building a lorry-producing plant on the Kana River". With the destruction of the Cape shipping route this would further put us at the mercy of the Soviets.

THE TRAP

The pattern of events is now clear. To gain a stranglehold on Britain, to defeat us without a war, the Soviets have served to deprive us of our traditional sources of supply of essential minerals, etc, and to have our traditional industries, aircraft and shipping run down.

The EEC has been one means of running down our science and technology — and hence our industry. Before we began flirting with the EEC and with the Soviets our science and technology were the strongest in Europe. Now France is able to boast that she produces 56% more than Britain (what we don't invest in Soviet countries we invest in France). But investment in Soviet industry instead of in British industry has been a far bigger drain, and now the country has reached the stage when it will not be able to survive unless it builds up its strategic industries again. As aircraft and ships have been taken out of service they have been physically destroyed or sold abroad, so we are short of essential means of transport as well.

But to build up our transport and strategic industries again we will need high quality constructional materials, and these have been the subject of the "superior" barter with the USSR, the deal being in the hands of multinational corporations and not of genuinely British concerns. Most important of these essential minerals is chromium, that is a vital component of high strength constructional materials, although several other metals are not far behind in importance. And the only viable sources of chromium are Russia and Rhodesia, together with South Africa.

Sanctions against Rhodesia were a means of encouraging us to use Russia as the sole source, while Kissinger has now made it plain that the Rhodesian minerals have been the real object of the exercise. In his speech in Nairobi in May he proposed a role for multinational corporations in exchanging technology for raw materials, and the creation of a new international resources bank. In other words, what his Masters are after is to get hold of the chromium and other minerals, and have them handled by organizations and individuals already cooperating with the Soviets. The United States has taken the precaution, in spite of approving sanctions for us, of building up a seven year stock of chromium ore.

Without these raw materials we cannot rebuild our industry, transport or defences. We shall be slaves indeed."

Humanly speaking our situation appears already hopeless BUT NEVER DESPAIR, IF IT APPEARED SO TO US WE WOULD HAVE LEFT THE FIELD OF BATTLE LONG AGO. HOWEVER BLACK THE PRESENT OUTLOOK, WE KNOW THE POWERS OF HELL ARE NOT GOING TO PREVAIL AND THEY CAN ONLY HOLD US DOWN WHILE FAITH BURNS LOW SO PICK UP THAT SWORD THAT CHRIST BROUGHT — EVEN IF WE ARE ONLY AFTER-WARNED WE CAN STILL FOREARM A FRIEND AGAINST THE NEXT ATTACK. THE LAST TWELVE YEARS SHOW THAT WE CAN NEVER BE CONQUERED SO WHY SURRENDER ?

Reprinted from the February-March 1978 issue of **Candour.** Never say we didn't tell you!

A MINE OF INFORMATION - You will never find anything of greater worth than vintage **Candour.** Now is the time to build your collection of past issues. Original copies from the 1950s and 1960s at 30p each or five for £1. Obtainable from CANDOUR PUBLISHING COMPANY.

THE WAY OF THE WORLD

Gleanings from the Candour Press Desk

CLASS OF '87

"KINGSBURY County Grammar, in the London borough of Brent, went comprehensive the year after I left, to become Kingsbury High, increasing in size from 800 to 1,600. The headmaster sent me an advance copy of the programme for the prize-giving, and I dug out an old speech day programme from my own day. I scanned the lists of names of GCE candidates and prize-winners. It was fascinating. Rowan Atkinson used to do an excellent cabaret sketch of a schoolmaster reading out a roll-call. He might try this exercise at Kingsbury High.

"First, the 1962 list of successful students under the letter P; 'Pither, Pollak, Pope, Poston, Potter, Procter, Pursell.' Now, the 1987 list: 'Pagliucia, Pandya, Parekh, Parker, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel, Patel...' A total of 16 members of the Patel families in this year's GCE list alone, and but a single Smith! The Patels know a good school when they see one."

Valerie Grove in **The Sunday Times**, December 20th.

WALL OF RESENTMENT GREETS FEMINIST BRICKIES

"A LONDON Council was accused today of hiring women bricklayers to try and 'prove' its equal opportunities policy. Labour-controlled Haringey has taken on up to 60 women to work in the council's house-building department. But the move has angered the department's male workers. They have sent a circular to councillors and chief officers complaining that special privileges are being given to the women. 'Not only are they earning more than skilled workers, they are trying to demand that men, even with longer service, should be made redundant before them.' Women are also allowed special time off to attend 'women's meetings' in addition to normal trade union duties, say the men. One report said the women were being paid up to £13,000-a-year."

Evening Standard, December 29th.

REFUGEE AID TO FRANCE?

"THE United States will provide $8 million of its scarce refugee funds for the year to build parochial schools in France for North African Jews. Only they are not refugees. Except to Congress and Senator Daniel Inouye, that is, who so labelled them in the pre-adjournment rush to finish the gigantic appropriations bill. The respected Hawaiian Democrat is not talking about his $8 million gift for French Jewish schools. The project's sponsor is Ozar Hatorah, a New York-based organisation on whose board sits a contributor to Senator Inouye's most recent election campaign. May congressional consciences, hearing campaign funding's siren song, be pricked by this wrong."

International Herald Tribune, January 2nd.

WHY U.S. PUTS UP WITH 'NAUGHTY CHILD' ISRAEL

"AS the PLO celebrates its 23rd. anniversary this weekend, its leader, Mr. Yasser Arafat, must be more bewildered than ever at the unshakeable strength of the American-Israeli alliance. I once interviewed Mr. Arafat in Tripoli. 'Why,' he asked, 'does America always put up with that naughty little child, Israel?' It is a good question....

"Last week there was a wailing and gnashing of teeth from Jerusalem, after a mild rap on the knuckles from the Washington administration. The US objected to the brutal methods of Mr. Yitzhak Shamir, the Prime Minister, in putting down Palestinian riots in the occupied territories. Americans saw pictures of Israeli soldiers kicking hand-cuffed Palestinian prisoners and film of plain-clothed Israeli security agents firing from the hip, with apparent indiscrimination, at the rioters. The US abstained in a UN General Assembly censure instead of vetoing the resolution as it usually does. Mr. Shamir, his government and many of his US supporters were appalled.

"Despite this public tiff, the US-Israeli alliance has never been stronger. As the American administration admonished Israel, Mr. Reagan signed a $3 billion grant to Israel.... 'We have everything we want,' a leading member of the Israeli lobby in Washington said. But why? Mr. Arafat's answer, echoed by many Americans, is the power of the Jewish lobby in America. [It] has an influence far beyond its size. It funds political candidates and can turn out the crucial votes in local and national elections. The lobby's leaders are relentless in their pursuit of pro-Israeli policies. They know the corridors of power on Capitol Hill and present their case with a brilliance that outshines the other professional arm-twisters...."

David Blundy in **The Sunday Telegraph**, January 3rd.

TRIAGE AND ERROR

"MR. Grant Williams has resigned as consultant urologist at the Charing Cross hospital because sex-change operations - available free on the NHS - are taking precedence over urgent cancer operations. Mr. Williams says he could do ten exploratory operations for cancer of the bladder in the time taken by one sex-change operation. [His] honourable and principled resignation has drawn attention to the fact that there is more than money behind the NHS crisis. Since World War I, health authorities worldwide have had to use triage, the science of spreading limited medical resources to best effect. If sex-changes are preventing cancer operations, the NHS has got its triage wrong. A detailed examination of hospital waiting-lists may well show that there are many other such anomalies."

Evening Standard, January 5th.

THREE PROTESTS AND THE POSTER WAS TAKEN DOWN

"CADBURY'S are to remove hundreds of posters after just three people complained that they were racist. Rather than risk further complaints the firm has cancelled part of a major national advertising campaign and ordered that 300 posters for Creme Eggs are replaced by others in the series. The advertisement shows a drawing of an Indian wearing a

Creme Egg as a turban with the slogan, 'Keep another handy, Gandhi.' Others - which have so far escaped the critics - include 'Let your tongue loose, Bruce' on an Australian theme, 'Chocks away, Ray' featuring a war-time flying ace, and 'By Easter they are long gone, John' which uses a caricature of Long John Silver. The Bishop of Dudley, the Rt. Rev. Tony Dumper, who is chairman of the local race relations council, said, 'The poster could be construed as racist but it was also trivialising Gandhi, a person who was one of the great human beings of the world.'"

Daily Mail, January 16th.

THE TWO BILLION POUND RIP-OFF

AN investigation by BBC television's **Panorama** on February 8th. revealed how the few effective checks and controls employed by the EEC's Common Agricultural Policy results in it serving as "the greatest incentive to crime in Western Europe". In Northern Ireland grain and cattle are smuggled over the border and in some cases the IRA takes a cut of the profits. In Germany beef traders have earned millions by forging export documents. And in Sicily the Mafia claims subsidies for tons of oranges that don't even exist! The whole racket is estimated to cost the Community ten per cent of its budget each year.

Then there's the scandal of the Common Market food mountains. This shames us all, and in particular the faming ministers of the EEC who condone over-production and let the mountains grow higher and higher. The House of Commons Public Accounts Committee has said that the cost of storing the surplus food in Britain has risen by 400 per cent in the last two years to £118 million. Last spring's much publicised free give-away to pensioners and the needy disposed of only £20 million of butter and beef out of stocks of £1,100 million. Yet the year before Communist Russia was able to take advantage of the supluses by paying £46 million for food with a book value of £110 million!

Such are the "dynamic effects" of Common Market membership that we were promised prior to entry. The entire CAP is symptomatic of the cumbersome, inefficient and harmful bureaucracy that marks all aspects of the EEC's operations. Even the most fervent partisans of Market membership would be hard-pressed to identify any tangible gain it has brought us. The only way to recover our political and economic independence is to withdraw.

PULPIT POLITICS

ON January 24th. a Mrs. Russell of Willesden had this to say in the letters column of the **Sunday Express:**

"Last Sunday I went to church and was absolutely astonished when the vicar urged the congregation to pray for the safe passage of David Alton's anti-abortion bill. If we have politics preached from the pulpit, is it any wonder that many churches are so empty?"

Very true, very true! Why can't the parsons stick to true religion, such as the Third World, Apartheid, the Inner Cities, etc., etc?

THE MENACE OF USURY

ONE would have to search far and wide for a single apologist of the system of slavery as practised by the Southern States of the U.S.A. until a little over a century ago. Yet the whole of our modern society has for its economic basis a system that has been far more widely denounced as immoral and unjustifiable than ever slavery was. That system is Usury.

Usury is a word whose meaning has undergone changes through the centuries, and the modern dictionaries are by no means unanimous in defining its current interpretation. It is clear, however, that the word signified originally the practice of lending money at interest. St Thomas Aquinas said of usury: "It is in itself unjust to receive payment for the use of money which has, through a loan, become the property of another." Usury is, therefore, in the technical sense profit that is unjustly received simply for the act of lending. However, so elastic is our contemporary standard of morality that the meaning has been narrowed down to impute the lending of money at **exorbitant** rates of interest. Our ancestors were probably more honest than we are, for they regarded the exaction of three per cent as much a violation of the moral law as the imposition of 100 per cent.

Belloc's View Of Usury

Hilaire Belloc, that great champion of Distributism, offered these thoughts on usury in **Economics for Helen**, the book he wrote in 1924 for his sixteen-year-old niece. The example he cited was of a temporarily employed man asking a baker to lend his hungry family half-a-dozen loaves for a few days until he could earn some money with which to replace them. If the baker were to reply, "I will not let you have half a dozen loaves on those terms. I will let you owe me the bread for a month if you like, but at the end you must give me back **seven** loaves," **that** would be usury.

Belloc explained thus: "The man is not using the loan productively; he is consuming the loaves immediately. No more wealth is created by the act.... Therefore, the extra loaf being claimed is claimed out of nothing. It has to come out of the wealth of the community - in this particular case out of the wealth of the man who borrowed the loaves - instead of coming out of an increment or excess of new wealth. That is why usury is called 'usury' - which means 'wearing down' or 'gradually dilapidating'. So for Belloc the test was whether the loan is productive or not. He held usury to be the lending of money at interest on what the creditor knows will be for an **unproductive** purpose.

Of course, the word can bear a wider implication than that of a generic term for the lending of money if we examine the basic principle involved. Dr. William Temple, a former Archbishop of Canterbury, stated this neatly when he addressed a meeting of the old Bank Officers Guild on February 4th., 1943. "The principle behind usury is quite clear," he said. "First, it is that money is in its own nature a medium of exchange, and if you use it as a commodity in the sense of trying to profit yourself by variations in its value over against goods, you are destroying it for its proper social purpose." In this widest sense, therefore, usury can be used to imply, not

merely the lending of money at interest, but the practice of trading in money as a commodity - an activity engaged in by banks, insurance companies and professional investors that is equally as unproductive.

Loud In Its Denunciation

Usury has been condemned and anathematised on moral, ethical and sociological grounds ever since the invention of money.

Most usurious practices result in the creation of debt, and the relationship of debtor and creditor is seldom a happy one. For the debtor, the acceptance of a loan involves a harder struggle to make ends meet, with part of his income earmarked to pay the interest, plus a haunting fear that the capital may be called in before he is ready to repay it. Even the creditor is not immune from worry. He may fear the debtor cannot keep up his payments of interest or that the value of the security is depreciating, which may urge him to press the debtor unduly. The very existence of the relationship of debtor and creditor bestows upon the latter an unwholesome power over the former. It is probably a more potent cause of human unhappiness than sex, without the compensation that the latter brings! Yet its tenacity is doubtless due to human selfishness, for it provides for the creditor the surest means of material advancement without effort.

The sociological evils inherent in the practice of usury have been recognised by all the great religions of the world. The Jews are expressly forbidden by Mosaic law to lend money at interest, although a trained economist with the time to deal thoroughly with the financial side of the Talmud would most certainly have a tale to tell! Moslems are also strictly prohibited by the Koran from practising usury.

Twin Pillars Of Christian Economy

During the Middle Ages, when the Catholic Church was in effective control of the economic policy of Europe, the twin pillars of Christian economy were the doctrine of the 'just price', coupled with the **complete prohibition of usury.** The Church Fathers were unanimous in regarding **all** interest as usury and, therefore, as a species of robbery. Mediaeval Canon Law treated the taking of interest as equally reprehensible for clergymen and laymen alike. The Second Lateran Council of A.D. 1139 condemned all usurers to excommunication and deprived them of Christian burial. Some authorities placed usury on a par with sodomy as a "sin against natural increase". Under such strict condemnation, the greedy-minded were largely prevented from amassing wealth.

It was not until the Reformation that the ban was lifted. Calvin had been the first to break openly with the Church's laws against usury when he allowed it in the case of a "productive" loan - nota bene Hilaire Belloc! (Of course, it was always accepted that there may be a legitimate reason for receiving a separate **profit** on the occasion of making a loan because of some extrinsic, incidental cost to the lender, such as working expenses or risk.) The Catholic Church continued to condemn usury until 1830, when Pope Pius VIII decided that those people who regarded the fact that civil authorities fixed a certain rate of interest as in itself a sufficient reason for taking interest, were "not to be disturbed". Despite this "compromise with

the Devil" and despite the fact that for over 150 years its voice has been virtually stilled, the Church has never actually retracted its teachings on usury.

Slipping The Leash

For over four centuries now, the usurers have had a free hand in Britain. Arguably, two events set usury running riot: the founding of the Bank of England (following the transfer once and for all of the Jewish financial centre from Amsterdam to London with the "Glorious" Revolution of 1688) and the Industrial Revolution.

The Bank of England was established on the basis of a loan of five million pounds to the unsuspecting public that was swollen to **fifty** million in twenty gin-slinging years. It released that vast proliferation of usurious practices which has upset the working of the economy and affected the lives of all of us to a profound degree. Thus arose, in William Cobbett's words, "loans, funds, banks, bankers, banknotes and a national debt; things that England had never heard or dreamed of before...things without which she had had a long and glorious career of many centuries." The financial methods of the 18th and 19th centuries inaugurated the present era of usury triumphant and facilitated the concentration of money and power. The free rein given to unbridled competition opened the way to a vast, property-less industrial proletariat, in subjection to what Pope Leo XIII denounced, in the encyclical **Rerum Novarum**, as "covetous and grasping men". The process was augmented by the growth of powerful monopolies controlling enterprises and raw materials.

These methods, therefore, made for violent inequalities, violent denials of the moral basis of our civilisation, although many were on hand to justify them because of the rapidity with which the nation's trade and industrial power were growing. Yet it was also an admission of defeat, and a complete justification of those philosophers who framed the ancient Christian laws against usury. We have tried the experiment which they feared. We slipped the leash which held usury in check and we have been rewarded with increasing wealth for the unworthy few who manipulate the economics of scarcity, with alternating gluts and famines, booms and slumps, not to mention two world wars within a single generation this century.

Parasites And Saboteurs

It is of fundamental importance to an understanding of usury that we should draw a clear distinction between the science of economics and this unwholesome financial practice.

The science of economics is, or should be, devoted to the production and distribution of real wealth in order to produce goods for consumption and services for the benefit of the community. Money is not real wealth. Its purpose, as set forth by St Thomas Aquinas, is to enable people to procure by exchange sufficient material goods required for their lives to be lived virtuously. This money-machine is liable to go wrong if it is tampered with, like any other machine. Usury is a financial practice which consists, in its very essence, of tampering with the machine, by taking the money and trading with it as if it were a commodity, by buying it and selling it, and by letting it out on hire. Thus money, invented by man for man's convenience, is

turned into a weapon against him. The practice of usury operates to sabotage, not to facilitate, the smooth working of the economy.

The usurers are not fools. They have taken infinite plans, amounting to (very warped) genius, to surround their activities with an aura of respectability and to imply that their practices, far from being obstructive and pernicious, really form an indispensable part of our economic machinery. Millions have been duped into believing this lie, when in reality **usurers produce nothing but debts which have no physical existence at all, which benefit no one but the usurers themselves, and which are demoralising and harmful to the community at large.**

Yet there are more serious objections to usury from the economic angle. We have only to consider the deplorable condition to which the usurers have reduced the monetary system of the world to appreciate the fact that they are not merely passive parasites, but active saboteurs. The present system of world finance is, in fact, the product of the international bankers. They themselves devised its laws, its customs, and its code of ethics (albeit a very perverted one). And it was the bankers who wove around it a veil of quasi-religious mysticism which has sufficed to disguise the monstrous nature of the whole scheme.

We should not be surprised. Bankers depend upon debt as vultures depend upon carrion. It is from debt alone that the sweet manna of interest comes welling forth, nourishing its recipients without the necessity for vulgar toil. Thus it was natural that the bankers should make every effort to increase the amount of indebtedness throughout the world. As their political power grew with their money power, so they were able to compel all and sundry once-sovereign states to conform with the intricate financial orthodoxies which they had devised for their own benefit.

The Mysteries Of High Finance

It is a measure of the fraudulent nature of much of received economics that probably not one in a thousand people **understands** the mechanism of usury. Nowhere is it explained in any of the many worthless textbooks on economics. And any journal or publisher (except our very own samizdat) that dared enlighten the present state of public ignorance would soon be easily checked by a twist of the credit-screw on which such hugely capitalised concerns depend. That is why when men get up and seriously suggest the way to alleviate our misfortunes is to borrow more money, no question is ever raised as to their sanity.

The basic tenet of this strange faith is what might be termed 'the doctrine of the indestructibility of debt'. Debts, being the sole source of interest, must never die. They are nourished by fresh advances, and should the yield of interest become a problem, the debt may suffer a conversion, or even a temporary suspension in desperate cases. The cancellation of a debt ranks as a defeat for the bankers concerned. Here is the very root of the problem. Interest is obtained by trading upon the necessities of others; hence the aim of money lenders is to create conditions which will force the public to come to them - **and stay with them** - for loans. In an advertisement in the **Sunday Times** last October, a finance house in Reading urged readers to "borrow £5,000 for only £69.25 a month" by paying interest only. So

after ten years (the maximum loan period), the hapless debtor will have paid £8,310 in interest and **still** have a capital debt of £5,000! And the loan company had the temerity to label this racket "The Freedom Loan"!

Writ large, the situation is repeated in the telephone-number loans and elastic repayment deadlines that characterise the debtors' money-go-round in Latin America. Today, practically every nation in South America is groaning under the burdens heaped upon them by the usurers of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund. Brazil is currently $4 billion in arrears, having paid neither interest nor principal on its $68 billion foreign bank debt since February 20th. So a quick 'top-up' loan of $7.2 billion was forecast in **The Times** in September to enable the unfortunate Brazilians to 're-finance' their debt! Presumably there will come a time when the amount of interest payable on a nation's accumulated debt will exceed the financial value of the total income of the population. Usury reductio ad absurdum!

Another fundamental tenet of the financiers' faith is that once a loan has been made, the purpose for which the debt was created is immaterial. Thus it comes about that we are still paying taxes to provide interest due on money which our forefathers subscribed to pay for the battle-cruisers which blew up at Jutland in 1916. The loans of the fathers shall be visited upon the children even unto the ninth and tenth generations!

Every Briton's Heritage

And so debt, which like poverty, should be the complaint of occasional victims of misfortune and no more, is now the normal life-long state of us all. As the veteran monetary reformer, Arthur Kitson, put it in **The Money Question:** "Usury knows no period of depression, no time of stagnation, no failure of crops, no unfortunate speculations, no condition of ill-health and inability to produce. It takes no holiday, and refuses even to keep the Sabbath. It forever goes on as regular as time, and as relentlessly as gravitation, counting and adding to men's burdens, piling them higher and higher." Even if money were maintained at a stable level and controlled by bankers amiably disposed towards us (an impossible dream!), our ever-widening burden of debt would be a menace. But with money controlled by interests inimical to popular well-being and subject to violent, artificially-induced variations in value, we would seem to be almost wholly at the mercy of our enemies.

Nevertheless, our strength is in our convictions. We are **not** hoodwinked, as are so many of our countrymen, because we **know** that these vast debits are merely so many entries on the computer tapes of the mega-bankers to whom they provide life-sustenance.When eventually our revolutionary struggle for a new social order is over, the wealth of our nation will be counted, not in figures in books or computers, but in the strength and skill of our people and in the resources obtainable from our land that comprise every Briton's heritage. In the meantime, during the difficult times ahead, our utmost endeavour **as individuals** must be to keep out of debt or, if we have got a debt, to break out of it as quickly as possible. Free of such personal enmeshment, we are better placed to withstand the coming storms.

Originally published in abridged form in **Nationalism Today.** Available from Burning Books, BCM Burning, London WC1N 3XX, price £1.20.

WALKABOUT TO OBLIVION?

"IT is the fashion to decry Australia's bicentennial celebrations because the White migrants who landed on Aussie's shores 200 years ago proceeded to be beastly to the Aboriginals. In retaliation the Abos are threatening to stop Prince Charles and Princess Diana'a visit to Sydney on January 26. It should be pointed out, however, that before the White man got to Australia, the Abos were pretty beastly to one another. They were especially horrid to women and children. Because of the restless Aboriginal tradition of "walkabouts" - endless moving from place to place - mothers with small babies often perished.

"Infant mortality was stupendously high as nursing mothers, expectant mothers and ill mothers were expected to keep up with the tribal notion of walkies. And because they were never nice to mothers and small babies the Abo numbers always remained small: you need to care fór mothers and babies if you want the clan to survive and grow powerful. The White man was cruel, without doubt, but the Abos also indulged in cruel and heartless practices. And the coming of the Whites probably made life better for Aboriginal women and their children. It is even possible that had the White man not sailed into Botany Bay, the Australian aborigines would have died out altogether because of their casual attitude to infant deaths."

Mary Kenny in **The Sunday Telegraph,** January 17th.

WHEN IS A BABY DISPOSABLE?

"IN an article in this journal on October 17th., Mary Kenny quoted the pro-feminist gynaecologist, Dr. Peter Huntingford, as giving a straight answer to the question [the precise point at which it ceases to be 'right' to kill an unborn baby], or at least setting out the moral alternatives plainly. According to him, 'There are only two logical positions on abortion. One is that you favour the woman's right to choose at any stage in the pregnancy. The other is that you maintain the child's right to life from the start.' That is fair enough, except that I would replace 'the woman's right to choose' with the more honest and accurate words 'right to kill or have killed'.

"The right to choose' phrase, beloved of fierce women journalists and feminists generally, is peculiarly obnoxious because it associates having children (or not) with the notion of shopping and 'consumer choice'; a child in the womb is 'disposable', like panty hose or plastic cartons. In an article in **The Guardian,** Dr. Pamela Sims objected to this 'consumer-orientated attitude' to unborn life. She included in this approach the increasing use of what she termed 'quality-control tests to detect genetic abnormalities at an early stage of pregnancy', with the implication that it is necessary to destroy the abnormal - that is, the sub-standard. She suggests that what is wrong with our society today is 'an abortion mentality'...According to George Gale, the notion of the mother's right to kill is 'a modern obscenity'. He added: 'The very last thing a woman has the <u>right</u> to kill is the child she carries in her womb. But that child has a right, a very natural right, to enjoy the care and protection of its mother'."

Paul Johnson in **Westminster Record,** January 15th.

SLINGS AND ARROWS

WE'RE contemplating trade barriers against the Japs over an adverse balance of some £3.6 billion. With the E.E.C. countries, with which we have a trade deficit of £10 billion, we're trying to liberalise trade and remove barriers! The inhabitants of the Westminster Gasworks must see some logic in this situation: would they care to explain it to the mug-in-the-street? . . . . THE epidemic of A.I.D.S. (Anal Infected Disease Syndrome) could virtually bankrupt New Zealand by the middle of the 1990s, according to a N.Z. Opposition spokesman. Taxpayers are forking out $100,000 for every victim, which by 1997 will amount to a staggering 3 billion dollars a year. . . . STAFF working for loony-left Brent Council who call a colleague "dear" or "luv" are for the chop. This, and other heinous acts of "sexual harassment", like "page 3" calendars and asking a bird for a date more than once, will land you up before a disciplinary panel. Orwell's Anti-Sex League would have found such tommy-rot commendable. . . . "FRIGHTENED" Communist Viraj Mendis has been holed up in the sanctuary of a Manchester church for a year, scared stiff he'll be deported to Sri Lanka. The son of a wealthy tea-planter, he dreads a stretch inside and then another stretch on the end of a rope for his pro-Tamil activities, even though he's received repeated assurances from his family that it's safe to return home. Courted by bishops and bolsheviks, and appointed to the payroll of Manchester's farcical left-wing council as a £200 a year "immigration officer", this charlatan should be deported by the Home Office. Let him have his threatened hunger strike first, though: judging by his podgy picture in the **Sunday Express**, a dose of abstinence would do him a power of good! . . . . THE European Commission's latest brainwave is to slap V.A.T. on books, magazines and newspapers. It would be compulsory, with no member-state being able to decide not to impose the levy. A tax on books hurts everyone who loves, uses and relies on the printed word, and you'll have to fork out more for your **Candour** sub! So fire off that letter of protest to your M.P. NOW!

BLESSINGS OF EMPIRE

"THE first foreign port on my journey was Hong Kong. It has a glorious bay, the movement of ships on the ocean is beyond anything I have seen even in pictures, excellent roads, trolleys, museums, botanical gardens; wherever you turn you will note evidences of the most tender solicitude on the part of the English for men in their service; there is even a sailors' club. I drove around in a rickshaw, i.e. was borne by humans, bought all sorts of rubbish from the Chinese and got indignant listening to my Russian travelling companions abusing the English for exploiting the natives. Thought I to myself, yes, the English exploit the Chinese, the Sepoys and the Hindus, but they do give them roads, plumbing and Christianity; you exploit them too, but what do you give them?"

from **The Selected Letters of Anton Chekhov.**

Read SPEARHEAD. Edited by John Tyndall and published in support of the British National Party. Send 63p. for a sample copy to P.O. Box 446, London SE 23 2LS.

KISS ME MATE!

(with apologies to, but with admiration for, Cole Porter)

ANOTHER opening, another vow
For sodomy, another bow
Upon a night when thespian tide
In mutual adoration stride
On stage when called as "best of all"
In act, in art, of curtain-call,
A speech goes out which rues the day
That House of Lords might trespass "gay".

The world and all his wife are here
In uniformly evening gear
Like baboons gathered in the sun
They fill the auditorium;
For every "choice" - for any "cause"
Be sure they'll give full loud applause.

And he who made the heartfelt plea
For stage-promoting sodomy
Now calls for nominated "best"
To leave the floor and take bequest;
Thus "winner" takes his pride of place -
And plants a kiss on donor's face!

Then row by row and tier on tier
The watching tribe do clap and cheer
To signify - o lack-a-day -
Once Merrie England's awful gay.

Despite the presence of a Prince
And risk of - maybe - Royal wince,
Pro-sodomy gets loud applause
To oust from Bill an "anti" clause
Which, given number twenty-eight,
Would bar from stage, say -
"Kiss Me Mate"!

B.E. BIGGS.

THE PATRIOT was the high-quality patriotic magazine founded by the Duke of Northumberland in 1922. Its weekly issues contained a wealth of essential information on the occult forces affecting politics, history and religion. We have a stock of back numbers of **The Patriot** surplus to our archives that are available to U.K. readers for 50p each including postage. Order as many different ones as you like. Please make cheques payable to 'Candour Research Department'.

CANDOUR SUBSCRIPTION RATES

U.K. £5.00 OVERSEAS £6.00 AIRMAIL U.S. $12 AIRMAIL PER ANNUM

Printed and published by Candour Publishing Company, Forest House, Liss Forest, Hampshire GU33 7DD, England (Editor: Rosine de Bounevialle)